

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-6, 10-36, and 38-43 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 18, 21-22, 25, 30, 35, and 39 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejections of Claims 1-6, 10-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-36, and 39-41

Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-6, 10-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-36, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over US Patent No. 6,415,294 issued to Niemi (Niemi) in view of US Patent No. 6,510,406 issued to Marchisio (Marchisio) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,507,872 to Geshwind (Geshwind). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an automated method for assisting a user of a client system in retrieving and browsing information, the method comprising:

retrieving, by the client system, and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a first information page having first contents, responsive to user direction; and

automatically assembling and augmenting, by the client system, the first information page being browsed with one or more information source identifiers directly identifying one or more additional information pages with second contents that may be additionally retrieved, the one or more directly identified additional information pages being selected based at least in part on second keywords different from but determined to be related to first keywords present in the first information page, the first and second keywords being present in an established list of keywords relating the second keywords to the first keywords and provisioned based on established categories of keywords, and the second contents directly augmenting the first content.

The method of claim 1 augments the first information page with information source identifiers identifying information sources relevant to the second keywords, the first and second keywords being present in an established list of keywords relating the second keywords to the first keywords and provisioned based on established categories of keywords. The cited art fails to teach all the features of claim 1.

Niemi discloses a method of developing a list of keywords present in

documents viewed by a client system over time (see Table 1 and Column 8, lines 39-48 of Niemi). Niemi builds a database of documents viewed on the client system, creates a dynamic database of keywords contained in those documents using a probabilistic measure, and then embeds search queries into all keywords present in newly-downloaded documents. When selected by a user, the queries generate a list of all previously-viewed documents that also include the selected keyword along with an overall similarity calculation. The similarity calculation is a measure of the total number of keywords the two documents have in common. In claim 1, the first and second keywords are different, thus the method provides for augmentation of content, not simply a cross-reference to other documents containing the same keywords as a subject document. Niemi fails to teach other features of claim 1 as at least partially admitted in the Office Action.

Marchisio fails to remedy the deficiencies of Niemi. Marchisio discloses allowing a user to select any term in a downloaded page to generate related keywords (see Marchisio column 16, lines 38-58 and Figure 9). Thus, the relation between the selected term and the related keywords is not identified in an established list, rather the secondary terms are dynamically generated based on probability algorithms. Such a system requires the use of specialized algorithms to determine relatedness of various terms, whereas claim 1 provides a relational list/database that may be utilized without the need for such algorithms ensuring the related terms (second keywords) are as desired by the user or at least are provided as specifically defined in the established list/database. Marchisio fails to teach other features of claim 1 as at least partially admitted in the Office Action.

Geshwind fails to remedy the deficiencies of Marchisio and Niemi. Geshwind provides a mechanism for determining relevance of a particular document to a particular search query by matching displayed terms in the document to terms in a list of keywords. Geshwind thus requires that the displayed terms are the same as those terms in the list of keywords (they must match), whereas the first and second keywords in claim 1 are different. Claim 1 thus provides a relational list/database in which first keywords are related to second keywords, which may be further

categorized, but are not simply a list of keywords as provided in Geshwind. Despite the assertions in the Office Action, Geshwind does not teach or suggest the categorization of keywords. Column 8, lines 43-54, of Geshwind indicates that displayed terms may be matched to a terms in list of keywords. As indicated in Geshwind, that list of keywords is simply a singular list of terms of interest to the user, not a list of terms provisioned based on established categories, as provided in claim 1.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Geshwind fails to teach or suggest all elements of amended claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 recite similar elements as claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 are also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-6, 10-11, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 40-41 depend from claims 1, 25, 30, 35, and 39, respectively. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6, 10-11, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 40-41 are also patentable over the cited references.

Rejections of Claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 Under 35 USC 103

Claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Niemi in view of Marchisio and Geshwind and in further view of US Patent No. 6,271,840 issued to Finseth et al (Finseth).

Claims 12-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 depend from claims 1, 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39, respectively. As discussed above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Geshwind. Finseth fails to remedy the above-cited deficiencies of Niemi, Marchisio, and Geshwind. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above in relation to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 12-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 are patentable

over the cited references.

Independent claim 15 recites similar elements as claim 1. Further, claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15. Thus, for at least the same reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, Geshwind, and Finseth.

Rejection of Claim 43 Under 35 USC 103

Claim 43 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Niemi in view of Marchisio and Geshwind and in further view of US Patent No. 6,141,010 issued to Hoyle (Hoyle).

Claim 43 depends from claim 1 and thus is patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Geshwind for at least the reasons discussed above. Hoyle fails to remedy the above-cited deficiencies of Niemi, Marchisio, and Geshwind. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above in relation to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 43 is patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 10-36, and 38-43 are in condition for allowance and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2844. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: May 30, 2008

/Steven J. Prewitt/
Steven J. Prewitt
Registration No. 45,023

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503.796.2844